DMDC

Information and Technology for Better Decision Making

2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members

Statistical Methodology Report

CLEARANCE REQUEST FOR PUBLIC RELEASE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INFORMATION

(See Instructions on back.)

(This form is to be used in requesting review and clearance of DoD information proposed for public release in accordance with DoDD 5230.9.)

TO: *(See Note)* **Chief, Office of Security Review, 1155 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-1155**

Note: Regular mail address shown above. For drop-off/next day delivery, use:
Room 12047, 1777 North Kent Street, Rosslyn, VA 22209-2133

1. DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

a. TYPE	b. TITLE
Final Report	2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members: Statistical Methodology Report
c. PAGE COUNT: 38	d. SUBJECT AREA: Statistical Methodology, Sexual Assault, Sexual Harassment

2. AUTHOR/SPEAKER

a. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	b. RANK	c. TITLE
DMDC		
d. OFFICE		**e. AGENCY**
Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC)		DHRA

3. PRESENTATION/PUBLICATION DATA *(Date, Place, Event)*

Available for public release; distribution unlimited.

4. POINT OF CONTACT

a. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	b. TELEPHONE NO. *(Include Area Code)*
McGrath, David E.	571-372-0983

5. PRIOR COORDINATION

a. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	b. OFFICE/AGENCY	c. TELEPHONE NO. *(Include Area Code)*
Galbreath, Nate	SAPRO	571-372-2657

6. REMARKS

CLEARED
For Open Publication

MAY 23 2013 10

Office of Security Review
Department of Defense

7. RECOMMENDATION OF SUBMITTING OFFICE/AGENCY

a. THE ATTACHED MATERIAL HAS DEPARTMENT/OFFICE/AGENCY APPROVAL FOR PUBLIC RELEASE *(qualifications, if any, are indicated in Remarks section)* AND CLEARANCE FOR OPEN PUBLICATION IS RECOMMENDED UNDER PROVISIONS OF DODD 5320.9. I AM AUTHORIZED TO MAKE THIS RECOMMENDATION FOR RELEASE ON BEHALF OF:

DMDC

b. CLEARANCE IS REQUESTED BY 20130523 *(YYYYMMDD).*

c. NAME *(Last, First, Middle Initial)*	d. TITLE
Hoffman, Kris L	Acting Deputy Director
e. OFFICE	**f. AGENCY**
DMDC	DHRA

g. SIGNATURE	h. DATE SIGNED *(YYYYMMDD)*
HOFFMAN.KRIS.L.1230543697 Digitally signed by HOFFMAN.KRIS.L.1230543697 DN: c=US, o=U.S. Government, ou=DoD, ou=PKI, ou=DODHRA, cn=HOFFMAN.KRIS.L.1230543697 Date: 2013.05.21 16:30:02 -07'00'	

DD FORM 1910, JAN 2006 PREVIOUS EDITION MAY BE USED. Adobe Professional 7.0

13-C-0705

DMDC

Information and Technology for Better Decision Making

2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members

Statistical Methodology Report

DMDC Report No. 2012-052
September 2012

2012 WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY REPORT

Defense Manpower Data Center
Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program
4800 Mark Center Drive, Suite 04E25-01, Alexandria, VA 22350-4000

Acknowledgments

Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) is indebted to numerous people for their assistance with the *2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members (2012 WGRR)*, which was conducted on behalf of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness (OUSD[P&R]). The survey program is conducted under the leadership of Kristin Williams, Director of the *Human Resources Strategic Assessment Program* (HRSAP).

DMDC's Personnel Survey Branch, under the guidance of David McGrath, Branch Chief is responsible for the data processing, sampling, and weighting methods used in the Human Relations (HR) survey program. Fawzi Al Nassir, SRA International supervised the sampling and weighting processes and provided overall process control. He was assisted by Jeffrey Schneider, Mathematical Statistician, DMDC, in the development of the final stratified sample and the derivation of the final weights. Susan Reinhold and Carole Massey, DMDC, constructed the frame and performed sample selections. Fawzi Al Nassir and Jeffrey Schneider produced this statistical methodology report.

2012 WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY REPORT

Executive Summary

This report describes sample design, sample selection, weighting, and variance estimation procedures for the *2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members* (*2012 WGRR*).

The sampling frame consisted of 841,703 records drawn from the October 2011 Reserve Components Common Personnel Data System (RCCPDS) Master File. The *2012 WGRR* used a single-stage stratified sample design. The allocation was non-proportional, with over-sampling of small domains and population subgroups having low response rates. The total sample size was based on precision requirements for key reporting domains (reporting categories). The allocation was determined by an optimization algorithm that minimized the cost of the survey while meeting the precision requirements.

Analytic weights were created to account for unequal selection probabilities and varying response rates among population subgroups. First, sample records were classified for weighting according to eligibility for the survey and completion of the return. Second, the sampling weights (the inverse of the selection probabilities) were adjusted to account for sample members whose eligibility could not be determined. Third, the eligibility-adjusted weights were adjusted to account for eligible sample members who did not return usable questionnaires. Fourth, the adjusted weights were post-stratified to population totals. Finally, sampling strata were collapsed to create strata for variance estimation by Taylor series linearization.

Location, completion, and response rates were calculated for the sample and for population subgroups after the field closed and data were received. These rates were computed according to the RR3 recommendations of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR, 2011). The weighted location, completion, and response rates were 99%, 23%, and 23% respectively.

Table of Contents

Appendixes

List of Tables

Table of Contents (Continued)

Page

2012 WORKPLACE AND GENDER RELATIONS SURVEY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS: STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY REPORT

Introduction

This report describes the sample design, sample selection, weighting, and variance estimation procedures for the *2012 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members* (*2012 WGRR*). The first section of this report presents the sample design and sample selection procedures. The second and third sections provide information regarding the processing of sample and frame files and the statistical methodology used for weighting the sample of respondents.

Response rates for the *2012 WGRR* have also been computed in accordance with the RR3 recommendations of the American Association of Public Opinion Researchers (AAPOR, 2011). The response rates for the full sample and for subgroups and the computation methods are described in the last section of this report.

Sample Design and Selection

Target Population

The *2012 WGRR* was designed to represent individuals meeting all of the following criteria:

- A member of the Selected Reserve who (1) are in Reserve Unit, Active Guard/Reserve (AGR/TAR/AR;[1] Title 10 and Title 32), and Individual Mobilization Augmentee (IMA) programs from the Army National Guard (ARNG), U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), U.S. Naval Reserve (USNR), U.S. Marine Corps Reserve (USMCR), Air National Guard (ANG), U.S. Air Force Reserve (USAFR) or U.S. Coast Guard Reserve (USCGR).;
- At least 6 months of service by the beginning of the survey fielding period;
- Up to and including pay grade O6;
- Fielding of the survey began April 20, 2012 and ended on June 29, 2012**.**

Sampling Frame

The sampling frame consisted of 841,703 records drawn from the October 2011 Reserve Components Common Personnel Data System (RCCPDS) Master File. Auxiliary information used to develop the frame was obtained from the November 2011 CTS and October 2011 Family File and additional personnel records that were compiled before the scheduled starting date of the

[1] Names for this program vary among Reserve components: AGR/TAR/AR is a combination of Active Guard/Reserve (AGR), Training and Administration of the Reserve (TAR), and Active Reserve (AR).

survey field period: the November 2011 Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS) Point-in-Time Extracts (PITE). Individuals were included on the frame based on membership in both the November 2011 update of the RCCPDS file. Sample members who subsequently became ineligible were identified by comparison to the November 2011 updates of the RCCPDS and the November 2011 PITE (e.g., separation, incarceration). Other Individuals were identified as ineligible by the Survey Control System during the survey fielding period of April 20, 2012 through June 29, 2012 by self-report or proxy (e.g., separation, incarceration, illness, death).

Sample Design

The *2012 WGRR* used a single-stage stratified design. Four population characteristics defined the stratification dimensions: Reserve component, Gender, Pay grade group, and Reserve Program. These are shown in Table 1. The frame was partitioned into 130 strata, produced by cross-classification of the stratification variables. In some circumstances, stratification variable levels were collapsed within dimensions. Levels of Reserve program (TPU, IMA, AGR and Miltech) were collapsed as necessary to form reasonable size strata. In few occasions, levels of pay grade were collapsed. For example, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve Female Officers were collapsed for all officers pay grade levels (W1-O6) and all Reserve programs (TPU, IMA, AGR and Miltech) to form a single stratum. However, Reserve component and Gender were preserved.

Within each stratum, individuals were selected with equal probability and without replacement. Because allocation of the sample was not proportional to the size of the strata, selection probabilities varied among strata, so individuals were not selected with equal probability overall. Non-proportional allocation was used to achieve adequate sample sizes for small subpopulations of analytic interest, the survey reporting domains. These domains included subpopulations defined by the stratification characteristics, as well as others. Key reporting domains variables are also shown in Table 1.

Sample Allocation

The total sample size was based on precision requirements for key reporting domains. Given estimated variable survey costs and anticipated eligibility and response rates, an optimization algorithm determined the minimum-cost allocation that simultaneously satisfied the domain precision requirements. Anticipated eligibility and response rates were based on the *2008 Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Reserve Component Members* (*2008 WGRR*).

The allocation was accomplished by means of the DMDC Sample Planning Tool, Version 2.1 (Dever and Mason, 2003). This application is based on the method originally developed by J. R. Chromy (1987), and is described in Mason, Wheeless, George, Dever, Riemer, and Elig (1995). The Tool defines domain variance equations in terms of unknown stratum sample sizes and user-specified precision constraints. A cost function is defined in terms of the unknown stratum sample sizes and per-unit costs of data collection, editing, and processing. The variance equations are solved simultaneously, subject to the constraints imposed, for the sample sizes that minimize the cost function. Eligibility rates modify the prevalence rates that are components of the variance equations, thus affecting the allocation; response rates inflate the allocation, thus affecting the final sample size.

Although 124 domains had been defined for the *2012 WGRR* allocation, precision constraints were imposed only on those of primary interest. Generally, the precision requirement was that an estimated prevalence rate of 0.5 have a 95 percent confidence interval half-width no greater than 0.05. Constraints were manipulated to produce an allocation that achieved satisfactory precision for the domains of interest at a particular sample size.

The total *2012 WGRR* sample size was 75,436. Sample sizes by Service are shown in Table 2 for the levels of the stratification variables. The allocation by strata and by reporting domains are presented in Table A-1, and Table B-1 respectively.

Table 1.
Variables for Stratification and Key Reporting Domains

Variable	Categories
Reserve component*	Army National Guard
	US Army Reserve
	US Naval Reserve
	US Marine Corps Reserve
	Air National Guard
	US Coast Guard Reserve
	US Air Force Reserve
Sex*	Male
	Female
Pay Grade Group 1*	E1-E4
	E5-E9
	W1-W5
	O1-O3
	O4-O6
Program*	TPU/Unknown
	Military Technicians
	AGR/TAR
	IMA
Deployment	Deployed in the past 12 months
	Not Deployed in the past 12 months
Race	Non Minority
	Non Hispanic Black
	Hispanic
Sex by Paygrade Group 2	Female and Enlisted
	Female and Officer
	Male and Enlisted
	Male and Officer
Sex by Race 2	Female and Non Minority
	Female and Minority
	Male and Non Minority
	Male and Minority

Note. * denotes stratification variable.

Table 2.
Sample Size by Stratification Variables

Stratification Variable	Total	Army National Guard	US Army Reserve	US Naval Reserve	US Marine Corps Reserve	Air National Guard	US Air Force Reserve	US Coast Guard Reserve
Total	75,436	27,055	17,034	5,627	8,750	7,118	6,186	3,666
Sex								
Male	44,450	17,330	8,374	2,802	6,958	3,750	2,741	2,495
Female	30,986	9,725	8,660	2,825	1,792	3,368	3,445	1,171
Pay Grade Group 1								
E1-E4	39,844	17,161	9,874	1,621	5,522	2,150	1,930	1,586
E5-E9	23,001	7,442	4,696	2,364	1,538	3,381	2,539	1,041
W1-W5	1,250	711	237	13	163	-	-	126
O1-O3	5,816	1,242	1,423	672	577	732	603	567
O4-O6	5,525	499	804	957	950	855	1,114	346
Program								
TPU/Unknown	64,357	24,315	15,163	4,569	7,171	5,124	4,349	3,666
Military Technicians	3,472	1,240	595	-	-	1,109	528	-
AGR/TAR	5,176	1,500	998	1,040	549	885	204	-
IMA	2,431	-	278	18	1030	-	1,105	-

Weighting

Analytical weights for the *2012 WGRR* were created to account for unequal probabilities of selection and varying response rates among population subgroups. Sampling weights were computed as the inverse of the selection probabilities and then adjusted for non-response. The adjusted weights were post-stratified to match population totals and to reduce bias unaccounted by the previous weighting steps.

Case Dispositions

First, case dispositions were assigned for weighting based on eligibility for the survey and completion of the survey. Execution of the weighting process and computation of response rates both depend on this classification.

Final case dispositions for weighting were determined using information from personnel records, field operations (the Survey Control System or SCS), and returned surveys. No single source of information is both complete and correct; inconsistencies among sources were resolved according to the order of precedence shown in Table 3.

Table 3.
Case Dispositions for Weighting

Case Disposition (Samp_DC)	Information Source	Conditions
1. Record ineligible	Personnel record	Sample ineligible—deceased or no address available in DEERS.
2. Ineligible by self- or proxy-report	Survey Control System (SCS)	"Retired," "No longer employed by DoD," or "Deceased."
3. Ineligible by survey self-report	First survey question	Active duty member retired or separated from military; Reservist no longer member of a Reserve Component
4. Eligible, complete response	Item response rate	Item response is at least 50%.
5. Eligible, incomplete response	Item response rate	Survey isn't blank but item response is less than 50%.
6. Unknown eligibility, complete response	Personnel record, first survey question, item response rate	Incomplete personnel record and first survey item is missing and item response is at least 50%;
7. Unknown eligibility, incomplete response	Personnel record, first survey question, and item response rate	Incomplete personnel record AND first survey question is missing AND return is not blank AND item response is less than 50%;
8. Active refusal	SCS	Reason refused is any
		Reason ineligible is "other"
		Reason survey is blank is "refused-too long", "refused-inappropriate/intrusive", "refused-other", "ineligible-other", "unreachable at this address", "refused by current resident", "concerned about security/confidentiality."
9. Blank return	SCS	No reason given.
10. PND	SCS	Postal non-deliverable or original non-locatable.
11. Non-respondent	Remainder	Remainder

This order of execution is critical to resolving case dispositions. For example, suppose a sample person refused the survey, with the reason that it was too long; in the absence of any other information, the disposition would be "eligible nonrespondent." Given also a proxy report that the sample person had been hospitalized and was unable to complete the survey, the disposition would be "ineligible."

Case disposition counts for the *2012 WGRR* are shown in Table 4.

Table 4.
Sample Size by Case Disposition Categories

Case Disposition Category and (Code Value)	Sample Size
Record ineligible	1,673
Ineligible by self- or proxy-report	88
Ineligible by survey self report	388
Eligible—complete response	15,250
Eligible—incomplete response	2,000
Active refusal–refused, deployed, other	681
Blank return	392
PND—postal non-deliverable	1,067
Non-respondents	53,897
Total	**75,436**

Nonresponse Adjustments and Final Weights

After case dispositions were resolved, the sampling weights were adjusted for nonresponse. First, the sampling weights for cases of known eligibility (SAMP_DC = 2, 3, 4, 5) were adjusted to account for cases of unknown eligibility (Samp_DC = 8, 9, 10, 11). Next, the eligibility-adjusted weights for eligible respondents (Samp_DC = 4) were adjusted to account for eligible sample members who had not returned a completed survey (SAMP_DC = 5).

The weighting adjustment factors for eligibility and completion were computed as the inverse of model-predicted probabilities. First, a logistic regression model was used to predict the probability of eligibility for the survey (known eligibility vs. unknown eligibility). A second logistic regression model was used to predict the probability of response among eligible sample members (complete response vs. non-response). CHAID (Chi-squared Automatic Interaction Detector) was used to determine the best predictors for each logistic model. The models were weighted; the first by the sampling weight, and the second by the eligibility-adjusted weight. Predictors included the following population characteristics: Paygrade, Gender, Reserve program, Reserve component, Education, Family status, Combat/Non-combat flag, Deployment, and Race/Ethnicity. Both models included main effects and second-order interactions.

Finally, the weights were post-stratified to match population totals and to reduce bias unaccounted for by the previous weighting adjustments. Post-stratification cells were defined by the cross-classification of Organization, Gender, Family Status, Pay grade group, and Program. Within each post-stratification cell, the non-response-adjusted weights for eligible respondents and self-reported ineligibles (SAMP_DC= 2, 3, 4) were adjusted to match population counts. Note that one complete eligible respondent (SAMP_DC = 4) requested to be removed; thus, decreasing the total eligible respondents to 15,249 that received final weights.

Distribution of Weights and Adjustment Factors. Table 5 provides summaries of the distributions of the sampling weights, intermediate weights, final weights, and adjustment factors

by eligibility status. Eligible respondents are those individuals who were not only eligible to participate in the survey, but also completed at least 50% of the survey items. Record ineligible individuals are those who were not eligible to participate in the survey according to administrative records; no weights were computed for these cases. Table 6 indicates the sums of base weights, intermediate weights, and final weights by eligibility status.

Table 5.
Distribution of Weights and Adjustment Factors by Eligibility Status

Eligibility Status	Statistic	Sampling Weight	Eligibility Status Adjusted Weight	Complete Eligible Response Adjusted Weight	Final Weight With Non-response and Post-strati-fication Factors	Eligibility Status Factor	Complete Eligible Response Factor	Post-strati-fication Factor
Eligible Respondents	N	15,249	15,249	15,249	15,249	15,249	15,249	15,249
	MIN	1	1.64	1.75	1.4	1.34	1.07	0.34
	MAX	31.31	343.43	405.99	396.99	25.61	1.31	2.90
	MEAN	12.19	45.79	52.10	53.38	4.08	1.13	1.01
	STD	9.05	41.66	48.25	51.54	3.26	0.05	0.14
	CV	0.74	0.91	0.93	0.97	0.80	0.04	0.13
Self/Proxy Ineligibles	N	476	476	476	476	476	0	476
	MIN	1	1.64	1.64	1.67	1.34	.	0.69
	MAX	30.98	274.13	274.13	291.02	25.61	.	1.28
	MEAN	12.38	57.50	57.50	58.14	5.24	.	1.01
	STD	8.29	50.70	50.70	52.30	4.28	.	0.14
	CV	0.67	0.88	0.88	0.90	0.82	.	0.12
Non-Respondents	N	58,038	58,038	58,038	58,038	58,038	2001	1
	MIN	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.01
	MAX	31.32	274.13	50.25	50.88	25.61	1.10	1.01
	MEAN	10.92	1.72	0	0	0.17	0	1.01
	STD	7.48	12.33	0.21	0.21	1.15	0.02	.
	CV	0.69	7.17	240.91	240.91	6.82	44.73	.
Record Ineligibles	N	1,673	1,673	1,673	1,673	0	0	0
	MIN	1	1	1	0	.	.	.
	MAX	30.98	30.98	30.98	0	.	.	.
	MEAN	9.72	9.72	9.72	0	.	.	.
	STD	6.56	6.56	6.56	0	.	.	.
	CV	0.67	0.67	0.67				

Table 6.
Sum of Weights by Eligibility Status

Eligibility Category	Sum of Sampling weights	Sum of Eligibility Status Adjusted Weights	Sum of Complete Eligible Response Adjusted Weights	Sum of Final Weights With Non-response and Poststratification Adjustments
Eligible Respondents	185,853	698,264	794,452	813,976
Self/Proxy Report Ineligible	5,897	27,369	27,369	27,677
Non-respondents	633,689	99,788	50	51
Record Ineligible	16,624	16,264	16,264	0
Total	**841,703**	**841,685**	**838,134**	**841,703**

Note. One complete eligible respondent requested to be withdrawn from the survey. This respondent was removed, subsequently decreasing the number of eligible respondents.

Variance Estimation

Analysis of the *2012 WGRR* data requires a variance estimation procedure that accounts for the complex sample design. The final step of the weighting process was to define strata for variance estimation by Taylor series linearization. The *2012 WGRR* variance estimation strata correspond closely to the design strata; however, it was *necessary* to collapse some sampling strata containing fewer than 22 cases with nonzero final weights into similar strata. One hundred and three variance estimation strata were defined for the *2012 WGRR.*

Location, Completion, and Response Rates

Location, completion, and response rates were calculated in accordance with guidelines established by the Council of American Survey Research Organizations (CASRO). The procedure is based on recommendations for Sample Type II response rates (CASRO, 1982). This definition corresponds to The American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) RR3 (AAPOR, 2011), which estimates the proportion of eligibles among cases of unknown eligibility.

Location, completion, and response rates were computed for the *2012 WGRR* follows:

The *location rate* (LR) is defined as

$$LR = \frac{\text{adjustedlocatedsample}}{\text{adjustedeligible sample}} = \frac{N_L}{N_E}.$$

The *completion rate* (CR) is defined as

$$CR = \frac{\text{usableresponses}}{\text{adjustedlocatedsample}} = \frac{N_R}{N_L}.$$

The *response rate* (RR) is defined as

$$RR = \frac{\text{usable responses}}{\text{adjusted eligible sample}} = \frac{N_R}{N_E}.$$

where

- N_L = Adjusted located sample
- N_E = Adjusted eligible sample
- N_R = Usable responses.

To identify the cases that contribute to the components of LR, CR, and RR, the disposition codes were grouped as shown in Table 7. Record Ineligibles were excluded from calculation of the eligibility rate.

Table 7.
Disposition Codes for CASRO Response Rates

Response Category	SAMP_DC Values
Eligible Sample	4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11
Located Sample	4, 5, 8, 9, 11
Usable Responses	4
Not Returned	11
Eligibility Determined	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9
Self-Report Ineligible	2, 3

Ineligibility Rate

The ineligibility rate (IR) is defined as:

IR = Self Report Ineligible Cases/Eligible Determined Cases.

Estimated Ineligible Postal Non-Deliverable/Not Located Rate

The estimated ineligible postal non-deliverable or not located (IPNDR) is defined as:

IPNDR = (Eligible Sample—Located Sample) * IR.

Estimated Ineligible Nonresponse

The estimated ineligible nonresponse (EINR) is defined as:

EINR = (Not Returned) * IR.

Adjusted Location Rate

The adjusted location rate (ALR) is defined as:

ALR = (Located Sample - EINR)/(Eligible Sample - IPNDR—EINR).

Adjusted Completion Rate

The adjusted completion rate (ACR) is defined as:

ACR = (Eligible Response)/(Located Sample—EINR).

Adjusted Response Rate

The adjusted response rate (ARR) is defined as:

ARR = (Eligible Response)/(Eligible Sample—IPNDR—EINR).

Unweighted and weighted sample counts used to compute the overall response rates are shown in Table 8.

The final response rate is the product of the location rate and the completion rate. Sample Counts and weighted estimates are shown in Table 8. Weighted estimates were computed using the sampling weights.

Weighted and unweighted location, completion, and response rates for select *2012 WGRR* domains are shown in Table 9.

Location, completion, and response rates for the full sample and stratification levels are shown in Table 10.

Table 8.
Comparison of the Final Sample Relative to the Drawn Sample

Case Disposition Categories	Sample Counts		Weighted Estimates	
	n	%	n	%
Drawn sample & Population	75,436		841,703	
Ineligible on master files	-1673	2.22%	-16,264	1.93%
Self-reported ineligible	-476	0.63%	-5,897	0.70%
Total: Ineligible	-2,149	2.85%	-22,161	2.63%
Eligible sample	73,287	97.15%	819,542	97.37%
Not located (estimated ineligible)	-27	0.04%	-251	0.03%
Not located (estimated eligible)	-1,040	1.38%	-9,410	1.12%
Total not located	-1,067	1.41%	-9,661	1.15%
Located sample	72,220	95.74%	809,881	96.22%
Requested removal from survey mailings	-681	0.90%	-8,342	0.99%
Returned blank	-392	0.52%	-4,366	0.52%
Skipped key questions	-2000	2.65%	-22,697	2.70%
Did not return a survey (estimated ineligible)	-1365	1.81%	-15,278	1.82%
Did not return a survey (estimated eligible)	-52,532	69.64%	-573,315	68.11%
Total: Nonresponse	-56,970	75.52%	-623,998	74.14%
Usable responses	15,250	20.22%	185,883	22.08%

Table 9.
Location, Completion, and Response Rates

Type of Rate	Computation	Unweighted	Weighted
Location	Adjusted located sample/Adjusted eligible sample	98.6%	98.8%
Completion	Usable responses/Adjusted located sample	21.5%	23.4%
Response	Usable responses/Adjusted eligible sample	21.2%	23.1%

Table 10.
Rates for Full Sample and Stratification Level

DomVar	Domain	Sample	Usable Responses	Sum of Weights	Eligibility Adjusted Response Rate	Location Rate	Completion Rate	Response Rate
All DoD	Sample	75,436	15,250	841,703	23.23 ± 0.36	98.8%	23.4%	23.1%
Reserve Component	Army National Guard	27,055	4,385	354,892	19.41 ± 0.53	98.9%	19.5%	19.3%
	US Army Reserve	17,034	3,227	201,706	22.41 ± 0.72	99.0%	22.5%	22.3%
	US Naval Reserve	5,627	1,400	63,268	26.57 ± 1.32	96.8%	27.3%	26.4%
	US Marine Corps Reserve	8,750	764	39,231	7.52 ± 0.55	97.3%	7.6%	7.4%
	Air National Guard	7,118	2,391	104,322	36.40 ± 1.27	99.6%	36.4%	36.3%
	US Air Force Reserve	6,186	1,702	70,423	29.32 ± 1.35	99.4%	29.4%	29.2%
	US Coast Guard Reserve	3,666	1,381	7,861	37.30 ± 1.63	99.6%	37.4%	37.3%
Gender	Male/Unknown	44,450	8,412	690,137	22.87 ± 0.43	98.9%	23.0%	22.8%
	Female	30,986	6,838	151,566	24.89 ± 0.47	98.5%	25.1%	24.8%
Pay Grade Group	E1-E3	18,376	1,597	157,187	9.72 ± 0.50	97.9%	9.8%	9.6%
	E4	21,468	2,554	201,360	11.36 ± 0.47	98.5%	11.4%	11.3%
	E5-E6	17,064	4,083	259,337	24.99 ± 0.74	99.1%	25.1%	24.9%
	E7-E9	5,937	2,559	98,315	46.42 ± 1.43	99.7%	46.4%	46.3%
	W1-W5	1,250	507	11,862	41.10 ± 2.96	99.6%	41.0%	40.9%
	O1-O3	5,816	1,780	56,094	29.50 ± 1.49	99.0%	29.8%	29.4%
	O4-O6	5,525	2,170	57,547	42.79 ± 1.72	99.5%	42.9%	42.7%
Reserve Program	TPU/Unknown	64,357	11,255	692,932	19.30 ± 0.36	98.7%	19.4%	19.2%
	AGR/TAR	5,176	1,893	74,295	41.43 ± 1.60	98.9%	41.7%	41.2%
	Military Technicians	3,472	1,407	60,641	42.98 ± 1.85	99.9%	42.9%	42.8%
	IMA	2,431	695	13,835	33.10 ± 2.25	99.1%	33.3%	33.0%

References

American Association for Public Opinion Research. (2000). *Standard definitions: Final dispositions of case codes and outcome rates for surveys.* Ann Arbor, MI: Author.

Chromy, J. R. (1987). Design optimization with multiple objectives. *Proceedings: Papers presented at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, San Francisco, CA, August 17-20, 1987,* (194-199). Alexandria, VA: The Association.

Council of American Survey Research Organizations. (1982). *On the definition of response rates: A special report of the CASRO Task Force on Completion Rates,* (Lester R Frankel, Chair). Port Jefferson, NY: Author.

Dever, J. A., and Mason, R. E. (2003). *DMDC sample planning tool: Version 2.1*. Arlington VA: DMDC.

Mason, R. E., Wheeless, S. C., George, B. J., Dever, J. A., Riemer, R. A., and Elig, T. W. (1995). "Sample allocation for the Status of the Armed Forces Surveys." *Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, Volume II, American Statistical Association*, 769-774.

Riemer, R. A., & Kroeger, K. R. (2003). *Statistical design of the Status of Forces Surveys of Reserve Component Members* (Report No. 2003-011). Arlington, VA: DMDC.

Appendix A.
Sample Allocation

Table A-1.
Sample Allocation

Strata	Stratum Size	Allocation	Sample Size	Pct Sampled	Label
1	143,612	1,357	10,412	7.30	001 ANG__Male__E1-E4_TPU
2	2,061	27	109	5.30	002 ANG__Male__E1-E4_AgrMil
3	88,437	1,338	3,961	4.50	003 ANG__Male__E5-E9_TPU
4	18,797	380	660	3.50	004 ANG__Male__E5-E9_AGR
5	12,596	232	465	3.70	005 ANG__Male__E5-E9_MilTech
6	4,302	172	359	8.30	006 ANG__Male__W1-W5_TPU
7	1,216	61	88	7.20	007 ANG__Male__W1-W5_AGR
8	1,853	79	146	7.90	008 ANG__Male__W1-W5_MilTech
9	17,684	298	702	4.00	009 ANG__Male__O1-O3_TPU
10	1,317	26	46	3.50	010 ANG__Male__O1-O3_AGR
11	882	16	33	3.70	011 ANG__Male__O1-O3_MilTech
12	5,905	114	206	3.50	012 ANG__Male__O4-O6_TPU
13	3,148	66	102	3.20	013 ANG__Male__O4-O6_AGR
14	1,284	27	41	3.20	014 ANG__Male__O4-O6_MilTech
15	29,120	1,109	6,518	22.40	015 ANG__Female__E1-E4_TPU
16	749	40	122	16.30	016 ANG__Female__E1-E4_AgrMil
17	10,503	580	1,607	15.30	017 ANG__Female__E5-E9_TPU
18	3,912	279	484	12.40	018 ANG__Female__E5-E9_AGR
19	2,142	147	265	12.40	019 ANG__Female__E5-E9_MilTech
20	356	27	56	15.70	020 ANG__Female__W1-W5_TPU
21	452	40	62	13.70	021 ANG__Female__W1-W5_AgrMil
22	2,856	178	402	14.10	022 ANG__Female__O1-O3_TPU
23	225	17	29	12.90	023 ANG__Female__O1-O3_AGR
24	227	16	30	13.20	024 ANG__Female__O1-O3_MilTech
25	743	54	92	12.40	025 ANG__Female__O4-O6_TPU
26	513	40	58	11.30	026 ANG__Female__O4-O6_AgrMil
27	70,106	724	4,645	6.60	027 AR__Male__E1-E4_TPU
28	640	9	39	6.10	028 AR__Male__E1-E4_NotTPU
29	44,902	708	1,926	4.30	029 AR__Male__E5-E9_TPU
30	8,539	162	319	3.70	030 AR__Male__E5-E9_AGR
31	4,067	75	153	3.80	031 AR__Male__E5-E9_MilTech
32	422	13	34	8.10	032 AR__Male__E5-E9_IMA
33	12,277	304	661	5.40	033 AR__Male__W1-O3_TPU
34	2,055	77	141	6.90	034 AR__Male__W1-O3_AgrMil
35	400	15	38	9.50	035 AR__Male__W1-O3_IMA
36	8,055	166	260	3.20	036 AR__Male__O4-O6_TPU

Table A-1. (continued)

Strata	Stratum Size	Allocation	Sample Size	Pct Sampled	Label
37	1,999	42	65	3.30	037 AR__Male__O4-O6_AGR
38	303	7	10	3.30	038 AR__Male__O4-O6_MilTech
39	1,304	49	83	6.40	039 AR__Male__O4-O6_IMA
40	22,742	858	5,128	22.50	040 AR__Female__E1-E4_TPU
41	333	16	62	18.60	041 AR__Female__E1-E4_AgrMil
42	10,299	555	1,615	15.70	042 AR__Female__E5-E9_TPU
43	2,690	173	373	13.90	043 AR__Female__E5-E9_AGR
44	1,852	122	240	13.00	044 AR__Female__E5-E9_MilTech
45	146	15	36	24.70	045 AR__Female__E5-E9_IMA
46	257	19	42	16.30	046 AR__Female__W1-W5_TPU
47	219	19	35	16.00	047 AR__Female__W1-W5_NotTPU
48	4,498	265	641	14.30	048 AR__Female__O1-O3_TPU
49	560	43	102	18.20	049 AR__Female__O1-O3_NotTPU
50	2,100	150	245	11.70	050 AR__Female__O4-O6_TPU
51	584	43	70	12.00	051 AR__Female__O4-O6_AgrMil
52	357	42	71	19.90	052 AR__Female__O4-O6_IMA
53	12,146	135	818	6.70	053 NR__Male__E1-E4_AllPrograms
54	21,780	365	941	4.30	054 NR__Male__E5-E9_TPU
55	4,811	84	266	5.50	055 NR__Male__E5-E9_NotTPU
56	3,532	113	249	7.00	056 NR__Male__W1-O3_TPU
57	298	9	27	9.10	057 NR__Male__W1-O3_NotTPU
58	6,580	230	396	6.00	058 NR__Male__O4-O6_TPU
59	1,258	43	105	8.30	059 NR__Male__O4-O6_NotTPU
60	3,136	133	665	21.20	060 NR__Female__E1-E4_TPU
61	477	20	138	28.90	061 NR__Female__E1-E4_NotTPU
62	5,217	302	815	15.60	062 NR__Female__E5-E9_TPU
63	1,631	95	342	21.00	063 NR__Female__E5-E9_NotTPU
64	1,052	168	409	38.90	064 NR__Female__W1-O3_AllPrograms
65	1,350	247	456	33.80	065 NR__Female__O4-O6_AllPrograms
66	25,233	258	4,456	17.70	066 MCR__Male__E1-E4_TPU
67	300	4	69	23.00	067 MCR__Male__E1-E4_NotTPU
68	5,925	93	683	11.50	068 MCR__Male__E5-E9_TPU
69	1,431	26	156	10.90	069 MCR__Male__E5-E9_AGR
70	1,088	30	145	13.30	070 MCR__Male__E5-E9_IMA
71	858	67	477	55.60	071 MCR__Male__W1-O3_TPU
72	362	37	169	46.70	072 MCR__Male__W1-O3_NotTPU
73	791	83	312	39.40	073 MCR__Male__O4-O6_TPU
74	234	25	100	42.70	074 MCR__Male__O4-O6_AGR
75	1,203	157	391	32.50	075 MCR__Male__O4-O6_IMA
76	997	177	997	100.00	076 MCR__Female__E1-E4_AllPrograms

Table A-1. (continued)

Strata	Stratum Size	Allocation	Sample Size	Pct Sampled	Label
77	233	57	233	100.00	077 MCR__Female__E5-E9_TPU
78	321	96	321	100.00	078 MCR__Female__E5-E9_NotTPU
79	255	72	241	94.50	079 MCR__Female__W1-O6_AllPrograms
80	18,889	230	1,053	5.60	080 AFNG__Male__E1-E4_TPU
81	1,170	18	55	4.70	081 AFNG__Male__E1-E4_AgrMil
82	29,183	512	1,113	3.80	082 AFNG__Male__E5-E9_TPU
83	8,341	174	277	3.30	083 AFNG__Male__E5-E9_AGR
84	15,738	313	528	3.40	084 AFNG__Male__E5-E9_MilTech
85	3,158	91	221	7.00	085 AFNG__Male__O1-O3_TPU
86	423	14	26	6.10	086 AFNG__Male__O1-O3_AGR
87	522	16	35	6.70	087 AFNG__Male__O1-O3_MilTech
88	4,082	135	244	6.00	088 AFNG__Male__O4-O6_TPU
89	1,868	66	107	5.70	089 AFNG__Male__O4-O6_AGR
90	1,640	58	91	5.50	090 AFNG__Male__O4-O6_MilTech
91	5,121	228	979	19.10	091 AFNG__Female__E1-E4_TPU
92	393	22	63	16.00	092 AFNG__Female__E1-E4_AgrMil
93	6,303	385	862	13.70	093 AFNG__Female__E5-E9_TPU
94	2,840	203	344	12.10	094 AFNG__Female__E5-E9_AGR
95	2,173	153	257	11.80	095 AFNG__Female__E5-E9_MilTech
96	960	140	372	38.80	096 AFNG__Female__O1-O3_TPU
97	221	36	78	35.30	097 AFNG__Female__O1-O3_AgrMil
98	862	148	280	32.50	098 AFNG__Female__O4-O6_TPU
99	223	41	70	31.40	099 AFNG__Female__O4-O6_AGR
100	212	41	63	29.70	100 AFNG__Female__O4-O6_MilTech
101	12,670	151	736	5.80	101 AFR__Male__E1-E4_TPU
102	328	7	39	11.90	102 AFR__Male__E1-E4_NotTPU
103	19,501	334	780	4.00	103 AFR__Male__E5-E9_TPU
104	1,392	28	54	3.90	104 AFR__Male__E5-E9_AGR
105	6,090	121	214	3.50	105 AFR__Male__E5-E9_MilTech
106	1,930	61	153	7.90	106 AFR__Male__E5-E9_IMA
107	1,773	51	133	7.50	107 AFR__Male__O1-O3_TPU
108	199	7	16	8.00	108 AFR__Male__O1-O3_AgrMil
109	739	29	73	9.90	109 AFR__Male__O1-O3_IMA
110	3,554	120	221	6.20	110 AFR__Male__O4-O6_TPU
111	707	25	47	6.60	111 AFR__Male__O4-O6_AGR
112	1,004	37	58	5.80	112 AFR__Male__O4-O6_MilTech
113	2,649	123	217	8.20	113 AFR__Male__O4-O6_IMA
114	5,497	235	1,155	21.00	114 AFR__Female__E1-E4_AllPrograms
115	5,919	343	872	14.70	115 AFR__Female__E5-E9_TPU
116	450	30	65	14.40	116 AFR__Female__E5-E9_AGR

Table A-1. (continued)

Strata	Stratum Size	Allocation	Sample Size	Pct Sampled	Label
117	1,377	95	172	12.50	117 AFR__Female__E5-E9_MilTech
118	939	92	229	24.40	118 AFR__Female__E5-E9_IMA
119	862	79	234	27.10	119 AFR__Female__O1-O3_TPU
120	457	56	147	32.20	120 AFR__Female__O1-O3_NotTPU
121	1,098	123	243	22.10	121 AFR__Female__O4-O6_TPU
122	252	30	54	21.40	122 AFR__Female__O4-O6_AgrMil
123	1,036	153	274	26.40	123 AFR__Female__O4-O6_IMA
124	2,410	295	1,169	48.50	124 USCG__Male__E1-E4_TPU
125	3,159	265	549	17.40	125 USCG__Male__E5-E9_TPU
126	644	293	539	83.70	126 USCG__Male__W1-O3_TPU
127	381	163	238	62.50	127 USCG__Male__O4-O6_TPU
128	417	148	417	100.00	128 USCG__Female__E1-E4_TPU
129	576	249	492	85.40	129 USCG__Female__E5-E9_TPU
130	274	161	262	95.60	130 USCG__Female__W1-O6_TPU

Appendix B.
Allocation Solution for Reporting Domains

Table B-1.
Allocation Solution for Reporting Domains

Domain	Label	Pop Count	HWCI-Out	Allocation	Estimated n	Percent Sampled	Design Effect
1	All Domains	841,703	0.01	21,445	74,592	9.0	1.6
2	Army National Guard	354,892	0.01	6,720	26,848	7.6	1.4
3	US Army Reserve	201,706	0.02	4,671	16,918	8.4	1.4
4	US Naval Reserve	63,268	0.03	1,944	5,340	8.9	1.7
5	US Marine Corps Reserve	39,231	0.04	1,182	8,674	22.3	2.3
6	Air National Guard	104,322	0.02	3,024	7,071	6.8	1.4
7	US Air Force Reserve	70,423	0.03	2,330	6,100	8.8	1.5
8	Enlisted	716,195	0.01	15,486	62,112	8.8	1.5
9	Officer	125,508	0.02	5,959	12,485	10.0	1.6
10	E1-E4	358,547	0.02	6,201	39,593	11.1	1.5
11	E5-E9	357,652	0.01	9,285	22,609	6.4	1.4
12	W1-W5	11,911	0.05	604	1,235	10.5	1.6
13	O1-O3	56,044	0.03	2,396	5,776	10.4	1.7
14	O4-O6	57,549	0.02	2,959	5,473	9.6	1.6
15	Non-minority/Unknown	593,227	0.01	14,887	50,296	8.6	2.0
16	Minority	248,476	0.02	6,558	24,291	9.9	2.7
17	Male/Unknown	690,137	0.01	12,040	43,961	6.4	1.3
18	Female	151,566	0.01	9,405	30,613	20.4	1.2
19	Male/Unknown*Enlisted	587,690	0.01	8,529	36,555	6.3	1.1
20	Male/Unknown*Officer	102,447	0.02	3,511	7,408	7.3	1.3
21	Female*Enlisted	128,505	0.01	6,957	25,536	20.1	1.1
22	Female*Officer	23,061	0.02	2,448	5,080	22.2	1.2
23	Army National Guard*Enlisted	311,927	0.02	5,489	24,413	7.9	1.3
24	Army National Guard*Officer	42,965	0.03	1,231	2,434	5.7	1.3
25	Army National Guard*E1-E4	175,542	0.02	2,533	17,086	9.8	1.3
26	Army National Guard*E5-E9	136,387	0.02	2,956	7,353	5.5	1.2
27	Army National Guard*O1-O3	23,191	0.05	551	1,238	5.4	1.2
28	Army National Guard*O4-O6	11,593	0.06	301	496	4.3	1.2
29	US Army Reserve*Enlisted	166,738	0.02	3,430	14,466	8.7	1.4

Table B-1. (continued)

Domain	Label	Pop Count	HWCI-Out	Allocation	Estimated n	Percent Sampled	Design Effect
30	US Army Reserve*Officer	34,968	0.03	1,241	2,451	7.0	1.2
31	US Army Reserve*E1-E4	93,821	0.03	1,607	9,833	10.5	1.4
32	US Army Reserve*E5-E9	72,917	0.03	1,823	4,644	6.4	1.3
33	US Army Reserve*O1-O3	17,088	0.04	624	1,414	8.3	1.3
34	US Army Reserve*O4-O6	14,702	0.05	499	800	5.5	1.3
35	US Naval Reserve*Enlisted	49,198	0.04	1,134	3,752	8.1	1.5
36	US Naval Reserve*Officer	14,070	0.04	810	1,600	11.7	1.5
37	US Naval Reserve*E1-E4	15,759	0.07	288	1,551	10.3	1.5
38	US Naval Reserve*E5-E9	33,439	0.04	846	2,209	7.1	1.4
39	US Naval Reserve*O1-O3	4,779	0.07	286	661	14.1	1.6
40	US Naval Reserve*O4-O6	9,188	0.05	520	931	10.4	1.5
41	US Marine Corps Reserve*Enlisted	35,528	0.05	741	6,999	19.9	1.8
42	US Marine Corps Reserve*Officer	3,703	0.05	441	1,676	45.6	1.0
43	US Marine Corps Reserve*E1-E4	26,530	0.06	439	5,488	20.8	1.6
44	US Marine Corps Reserve*E5-E9	8,998	0.08	302	1,513	17.1	1.9
45	US Marine Corps Reserve*O1-O3	1,022	0.11	102	569	56.3	1.3
46	US Marine Corps Reserve*O4-O6	2,382	0.05	308	942	39.8	1.0
47	Air National Guard*Enlisted	90,150	0.02	2,238	5,492	6.1	1.3
48	Air National Guard*Officer	14,172	0.04	786	1,582	11.2	1.4
49	Air National Guard*E1-E4	25,573	0.05	498	2,144	8.4	1.3
50	Air National Guard*E5-E9	64,578	0.03	1,740	3,352	5.2	1.3
51	Air National Guard*O1-O3	5,284	0.07	297	730	13.9	1.5
52	Air National Guard*O4-O6	8,887	0.05	489	852	9.6	1.4
53	US Air Force Reserve*Enlisted	56,092	0.03	1,497	4,400	8.0	1.4
54	US Air Force Reserve*Officer	14,331	0.04	833	1,703	12.0	1.3
55	US Air Force Reserve*E1-E4	18,495	0.06	393	1,914	10.4	1.4

Table B-1. (continued)

Domain	Label	Pop Count	HWCI-Out	Allocation	Estimated n	Percent Sampled	Design Effect
56	US Air Force Reserve*E5-E9	37,598	0.03	1,104	2,491	6.8	1.4
57	US Air Force Reserve*O1-O3	4,030	0.08	222	599	15.0	1.3
58	US Air Force Reserve*O4-O6	10,300	0.04	611	1,104	10.8	1.3
59	Unmarried with Children	78,628	0.04	2,382	7,654	9.9	3.1
60	Unmarried without Children	360,867	0.02	7,966	36,216	10.1	2.2
61	Married with Children	285,762	0.02	7,646	20,246	7.2	2.3
62	Married without Children	115,939	0.03	3,435	10,461	9.1	3.1
63	Unmarried with Children+Unmarried without Children	439,495	0.01	10,350	43,870	10.1	2.2
64	Married with Children+Married without Children	401,701	0.01	11,079	30,703	7.7	2.3
65	E1-E3	158,378	0.03	2,681	18,265	11.6	2.2
66	E4	200,169	0.02	3,520	21,329	10.7	2.1
67	E5-E6	259,413	0.02	6,672	16,801	6.6	1.7
68	E7-E9	98,239	0.03	2,613	5,809	6.0	2.2
69	AGR	74,813	0.02	2,441	4,989	7.0	1.6
70	IMA	13,869	0.04	977	2,409	17.6	1.6
71	Female*E1-E4	68,982	0.02	2,986	16,138	23.5	1.1
72	Female*E5-E9	59,523	0.02	3,971	9,430	16.2	1.1
73	Female*O1-O3	12,127	0.03	1,101	2,634	21.8	1.1
74	Female*O4-O6	9,600	0.03	1,223	2,213	23.3	1.1
75	Female*AGR	14,917	0.03	1,120	2,332	16.4	1.2
76	Female*IMA	3,434	0.05	462	1,099	32.4	1.2
77	Female*Non-minority	87,599	0.02	5,784	17,955	20.7	1.7
78	Female*Minority	63,967	0.02	3,621	12,660	20.1	1.7
79	Female*ARNG*Enlisted	46,426	0.02	2,155	8,924	19.4	1.0
80	Female*ARNG*Officer	5,372	0.05	372	724	13.6	1.0
81	Female*USAR*Enlisted	38,062	0.02	1,739	7,400	19.6	1.0
82	Female*USAR*Officer	8,575	0.04	581	1,201	14.1	1.0
83	Female*USNR*Enlisted	10,461	0.04	550	1,842	18.7	1.1
84	Female*USNR*Officer	2,402	0.04	415	846	36.0	0.9
85	Female*USMCR*Enlisted	1,551	0.08	330	1,533	100.0	2.4
86	Female*USMCR*Officer	255	0.10	72	238	94.5	0.7

Table B-1. (continued)

Domain	Label	Pop Count	HWCI-Out	Allocation	Estimated n	Percent Sampled	Design Effect
87	Female*ANG*Enlisted	16,830	0.03	991	2,486	14.9	1.0
88	Female*ANG*Officer	2,478	0.04	406	860	34.8	0.9
89	Female*USAFR*Enlisted	14,182	0.04	795	2,456	17.6	1.0
90	Female*USAFR*Officer	3,705	0.04	441	945	25.7	0.9
91	Male*E1-E4	289,565	0.02	3,215	23,453	8.2	1.1
92	Male*E5-E9	298,129	0.01	5,314	13,157	4.5	1.1
93	Male*O1-O3	43,917	0.03	1,295	3,143	7.2	1.4
94	Male*O4-O6	47,949	0.03	1,736	3,262	6.9	1.3
95	Male*AGR	59,896	0.03	1,321	2,650	4.6	1.2
96	Male*IMA	10,435	0.05	515	1,310	12.7	1.3
97	Male*Non-Minority	505,628	0.01	9,103	32,335	6.5	1.6
98	Male*Minority	184,509	0.03	2,937	11,627	6.4	2.0
99	Male*ARNG*Enlisted	265,501	0.02	3,334	15,487	5.9	1.1
100	Male*ARNG*Officer	37,593	0.04	859	1,711	4.6	1.1
101	Male*USAR*Enlisted	128,676	0.02	1,691	7,065	5.5	1.1
102	Male*USAR*Officer	26,393	0.04	660	1,251	4.8	1.0
103	Male*USNR*Enlisted	38,737	0.04	584	1,908	5.2	1.1
104	Male*USNR*Officer	11,668	0.05	395	757	6.7	1.0
105	Male*USMCR*Enlisted	33,977	0.05	411	5,462	16.2	1.1
106	Male*USMCR*Officer	3,448	0.05	369	1,437	42.0	0.9
107	Male*ANG*Enlisted	73,320	0.03	1,247	3,005	4.1	1.0
108	Male*ANG*Officer	11,694	0.05	380	722	6.2	1.0
109	Male*USAFR*Enlisted	41,910	0.04	702	1,945	4.7	1.1
110	Male*USAFR*Officer	10,626	0.05	392	758	7.2	1.0
111	USCGR*E1-E4	2,827	0.05	443	1,573	56.1	1.0
112	USCGR*E5-E9	3,735	0.05	514	1,026	27.9	1.3
113	USCGR*O1-O3	650	0.05	314	556	86.2	0.7
114	USCGR*O4-O6	497	0.05	231	347	70.2	0.6
115	USCGR*Female*Enlisted	993	0.04	397	898	91.5	0.7
116	USCGR*Female*Officer	274	0.05	161	260	95.6	0.4
117	USCGR*Male*Enlisted	5,569	0.04	560	1,698	30.8	1.0
118	USCGR*Male*Officer	1,025	0.03	456	772	75.8	0.6
119	Non-Hispanic Black	123,175	0.03	3,373	12,342	10.1	2.9
120	Hispanic	82,726	0.04	2,020	7,834	9.6	3.0
121	Not Deployed in Last 12 Months	762,680	0.01	19,680	68,835	9.1	1.8
122	Deployed in Last 12 Months	79,023	0.04	1,765	5,756	7.4	2.7
123	TPU	692,712	0.01	16,232	63,850	9.3	1.6
124	Miltech	60,309	0.03	1,797	3,400	5.7	1.3

This page is reserved for insertion of Standard Form 298, page 1 -- this is best accomplished by replacing this page after the document has been converted to PDF

This page is reserved for insertion of Standard Form 298, page 2 -- this is best accomplished by replacing this page after the document has been converted to PDF


DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA